



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTE.

FURTHER NOTES ON THE ORIGIN OF THE GERUND AND GERUNDIVE.

In my essay on 'The Origin of the Gerund and Gerundive' in the Amer. Journ. of Phil., vol. XV, part 2 (July, 1894), pp. 194-216¹ [with respect to which it may be mentioned that Mr. W. M. Lindsay, The Lat. Language (August, 1894), ch. VIII, §§94, 95 (cf. also the Addenda et Corrigenda on p. 660), holds an identical view with that which I there put forward], I gave in support of my theory a list of compounds from Sanskrit, Greek, Italic, etc., in which the first member is in the accusative case, governed as object by the second member (Class IV of Noun Compounds in Brugmann, Grundr. II, §10). Inasmuch as Brugmann (ib., §§32, 36) has given scarcely a single example of this sort of compound in Italic, and only about four in Greek, and considering that such compounds are a distinct support to my theory on the origin of the gerund and gerundive, it will be well to add the following examples to those already given (in A. J. P. ib., pp. 204 sqq.).

¹ Addenda et Corrigenda: p. 201, after κόρυ-δο-ς omit the word 'supra'; for *vē-ḡi kṣē-ḡi* read *vē-ḡi kṣē-ḡi*; after "*prā-si* 'fill'" add "and many more in Whitney, Skr. Gram., §624"; p. 203, note 1, after "Skr. and Balto-Slavonic" add "see Brugmann, Gr. II, §108"; p. 205, after "Schweizer-Sidler, Latin Gr.²" add "§48, f), p. 39"; for *vendex* read **vendex*; p. 206, after "Skutsch, De nominum Lat. compositione" add "p. 13, note 1," and see further below, p. 220; after "is qui aliquid semel arripit" add "v. Forcellini (edition 1871)"; p. 207, read **kred* for **kred*, and *mr̥dā-ti mr̥dikā- mer̥z̥dika-* for *mr̥dd-ti mr̥dikā mer̥z̥dika*, and on the etymology of the three latter words, see further below, p. 221, note 1; p. 208, for *mirsz-ti* read *mīrsz-ti*; p. 211, add to "*sāntvayāmāsa* 'he hushed, soothed'" the following note: "With the formation of *sāntvayāmāsa* and the like we may perhaps compare the Homeric ἀκήν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ, where ἀκήν is certainly the fossilised acc. of ἀκή (Il. III 95; VII 92, 398; VIII 28; IX 29, 430, 693; X 218, 313; XXIII 676; and Od. VII 154; VIII 234; XI 333; XIII 1; XVI 393; XX 320); from the frequency of its occurrence we should imagine that this Homeric phrase was older than the analogous ἀκήν ἴσαν, which occurs, I think, only once (Il. IV 429)"; p. 215, for *ἐλ-ο-μαι *Fελ-ο- μει-άω* read *ἐλ-δο-μαι *Fελ-δο- μει-δ-άω*; p. 216, for "**da-om*, **dh-om*" read "**da-om* (or **dh-om*, in case the Latin gerund and gerundive contain Idg. *dh*, a view which is extremely unlikely, v. supra, pp. 198, 202 and 202, note 3)."

GREEK:

ξίφη-φόρος 'sword-bearing' beside ξιφοφόρος (: Lat. *ensifer*);
cf. A. J. P. ib., p. 202.

καρᾶ-τόμος 'head-cutting, beheading' from καρᾶ + τέμνω (cf. καρη-κομόωντες, A. J. P. ib., p. 205).

τερασκόπος from *τερασ-σκοπος (cf. Lat. *iustitium* from **ius-stitium*, A. J. P. ib., p. 205) beside τερατοσκόπος.

δικασκόπος, on a Lesbian inscription [Cauer, *Delect. Inscr. Graec.* (1883), No. 428, p. 266, = C. I. G. 2166], possibly from *δικασ-σκοπος (cf. τερασκόπος above) from *δικανσ-σκοπος (cf. δικασπόλος from *δικανσ-πολος, A. J. P. ib., p. 204), or just conceivably from *δικα, accus. sing. of *διξ [: Skr. *diḡ-* (v. Brugmann, ib. II, §161), cf. Lat. **dicem*, gen. *dic-is* (seen in the phrases *dicis causa*, *dicis gratia*, *dicis ergo*), from nominative **dix* (all from √ *deḡh-* 'to point out')] + -σκοπος.

θυοσ-κός from θύος (accus. sing.) and κο(F)έω, lit. 'the man who heeds the sacrifice,' hence 'the sacrificing priest.' Osthoff, in Hübschmann, *Das Idg. Vocalsystem* (1885), *Nachträge*, p. 190, Brugmann, *Gr. I* (1886), §§439, 578, 589, G. Meyer, *Gr. Gr.*² (1886), §248, and Stolz, *Lat. Gr.*² (1890), §15, Rem., p. 264, divide θυοσκός differently—θυοσ-κός—regarding -σμός beside κοέω as parallel to Idg. √ *steg-* beside Idg. √ *teg-* 'to cover' (v. Brugmann, ib. I, §589).¹ If θυοσκός could be considered by itself, there might perhaps be no objection to this explanation, for the form with *s* is established by Germanic: Goth. *us-skáu-s* 'provident, prudent,' O.H.G. *scouuōn* 'to look, view,' O.Icel. *skyn* 'insight' (beside the *s*-less form, which is represented by Skr. *kavī-s* 'seer,' *ā-kuvatē* 'intends,' Gk. κο(F)έω 'I mark, heed, observe,' Lat. *caveō*), but θυοσκός must be considered in the light of our next example, θυη-κός, which seems to prove conclusively that my division of the word—θυοσ-κός—is correct.²

θυη-κός (= θυοσκός Hesych.) contains θύη, the accus. plur. of θύος; so also

¹ The passages in which Liddell and Scott (7th edition) mention this word are inconsistent, for on p. 686 we find θυοσ-κός (s. h. v.), whereas on p. 820 the word is written θυοσ-κός (s. v. κοέω).

² It should be observed also that all the other Greek words preserving this root show the *s*-less form; e. g. ἀμνοκῶν, εὐρυνκῶσα, ἀ-κούω, and the proper names Δηϊκόων, Δημοκῶν, Εὐρυνκῶσα, Ἰπποκόων, Λαφοκῶων [preserved by Priscian (v. Brugmann, ib. II, §60, p. 113, Engl. ed.)] Λαοκῶν, Λαοκῶσα.

θυη-δόχος beside θυοδόκος,
 θυη-πόλος, with which cf. δικασπόλος above,
 θυη-φάγος.

ITALIC:

Latin: *torunda*, Corp. gloss. 2, 202, No. 34 (v. Georges, Lexicon der Latein. Wortf., s. v. *turunda*), and *turunda*, Cato, R. R. 89, Varro, R. R. 3, 9, 20, 'a ball of paste (for fattening geese),' from *torum*, accus. sing. of *torus* 'a swelling, protuberance,' + the suffix *-do-* from √ *dō-* 'to give' (cf. *kalendae kalandae* in A. J. P. ib., pp. 206, 207), so that *torunda turunda* would strictly mean 'that which gives a swelling, fat-giving.' For *torunda* : *turunda* beside *torus*, cf. *rotundus* : *rutundus* (cited e. g. from Varro, R. R. 2, 7, 5; 2, 16, 19; v. Georges, ib., s. v. *rotundus*) beside *rota*.

merenda f. 'an afternoon luncheon' from **merēm*, possibly an old infinitive of *mereo* (cf. A. J. P. ib., pp. 195, 196; and Lindsay, The Lat. Lang., ch. VIII, §95) + the suffix *-do-* from √ *dō-* 'to give.' *merenda* (s. c. *cēna*) might thus mean literally 'the meal which gives the reward, deserts, earnings'; cf. Forcellini, s. h. v.: "*Scalig. ad Varron. de R. R. dici putat a merendo, quod sit proprie cibus, qui datur aere merentibus, h. e. mercenariis.*" But this would scarcely be an attractive explanation. In considering *merenda* we must remember that it is an old word (v. the dictionaries), indeed a *very* old word, belonging to at least the fifth century B. C., if, as is probable, it is the same word as the Roman surname *Merenda*; we hear of T. Antonius Merenda, decemvir 450-449 B. C.; Q. Antonius T. f. Merenda, tribunus militum with consular authority, 422 B. C.; and also later (but still in the pre-literary period of Latin) Servius Cornelius Merenda, consul 274 B. C. Now, according to J. Schmidt, Pluralb., p. 432, the primary meaning of Lat. *mereo* is 'to get a (proper) share' [: Gk. μέιρομαι (from *μερ-ιομαι) μέρος, etc.; v. Liddell and Scott (seventh edition), s. v. μέιρομαι]. It would seem, then, that *merenda* was formed from *mereo* at a time when *mereo* still had its primary sense of 'share.'¹ Thus this word,

¹ That Lat. *merenda*, which thus literally means 'share-giving,' should have developed a meaning 'meal' may be closely paralleled by the Skr. compound *bhāga-dhāya-*, n., literally 'something to be placed or set as a share,' from Skr. *bhāga-*, m., 'a share' [from Skr. root *bhaj-* 'divide, share' from Idg. √ *bha₂-* 'to

handed down from a very old time, supports the remark of Lindsay (ib., ch. VIII, §95) that the surviving Latin compounds which show the first member in the accus. case governed by the second member 'may be relics of a mode of expression that prevailed much more widely in the pre-literary period of Latin.'¹

legiscrepa has been already mentioned in A. J. P. ib., p. 206, but without sufficient comment. *legiscrepa* = 'is qui legis (= leges) crepat,' just as *Lariscolus* = 'is qui Laris (= Lares) colit,' A. J. P. ib., p. 206; cf. Skutsch, *De nominum Lat. compositione*, p. 13, note 1. Compare Plaut., *Mil. Glor.* 3, 1, 56, i. e. l. 652 (not in the MSS, but reintroduced here from Servius ap. Verg. *Aen.* 1, 738; v. Lindemann on Plaut., l. c.), 'neque ego ad mensam publicas res clamo neque *leges crepo*.'

The following may be added to the instances of the accusative case compounded with the *finite verb*, A. J. P. ib., pp. 207 sqq.:—

distribute' (v. Brugmann, Gr. I, §450)] + Skr. *dh̥ya-* 'to be placed or set' [the so-called 'gerundive' or 'future passive participle' from Skr. root *dhā-* 'to place, put' (v. Whitney, Skr. Gr., §§961 sqq., and Skr. Roots, Verb-forms, etc., p. 82) from Idg. **dh̥s-* 'to place, put'], which is found in RV. with two meanings, the earlier of which is 'the *share* which men offer to the gods,' i. e. 'the sacrificial *meal*,' RV. 262, 4; 878, 1; 940, 3; 1028, 1. [The second meaning, which may be mentioned in passing, is 'the share which the gods give to men,' i. e. 'prosperity, blessing,' RV. 705, 8; whence later the more general meaning 'lot, fate,' e. g. MBh. Nala, viii 6 *Āpi nō bhāgad̥hēyam syāt* 'also would it were our lot (sc. to save the king)' (Kellner), or 'our own fate is now in peril' (Monier-Williams).] Thus in both the compounds under consideration, though totally unconnected in form, we see the same development of meaning: in both the prior member of the compound (Lat. **merēm*, Skr. *bhāgd-*) originally meant '*share*,' and in both cases the compound has developed a meaning '*meal*.' Compare also the development of meaning in the actual Idg. **bh̥h₂s-* 'to distribute' as represented in Greek, viz. *φαγ-εῖν* 'to eat' (Brugmann, Gr. I, §450). A similar transference of meaning may be seen in the following Greek forms: Gk. *δαῖζω* 'I cleave asunder, divide,' *δαίωμα* mid. 'I distribute,' pass. 'am divided' (: Skr. *d-yā-ti* 'divides,' *dā-ya-tē* 'divides,' Brugmann, Gr. II, §707 ad fin.), whence *δαίρρος* 'one who carves and portions out (esp. meat at table),' *δαῖς* 'meal, feast' (cf. *δαῖς ἐτόν*, which is explained by some scholars as '*an equally divided meal*, because each guest got his share,' Hom. Il. XV 95, etc.), *δαίτη* 'meal, feast,' *δαίνυμι* 'I give a meal, feast some one.'

¹ If Lat. *torunda* and *merenda* are rightly thus derived as in the text, they afford, together with *kalendae kalandae*, A. J. P. ib., pp. 206, 207, a close parallel to Lat. *venundō pessundō*, on which v. A. J. P. ib., pp. 208, 209.

ARYAN:

Sanskrit¹ *namas-kṛ-* 'make a salutation, do homage,' originally two separate words, *nāmas* 'homage' + the Skr. root *kṛ-* 'to make' [cf. RV. x 34 (= 860), 8 *rājā cid ebhyō nāma it kṛṇōti* 'any king, whoever he be, to them does homage indeed'], became so entirely regarded as a single word that it came to be used as such and fell under one accent (compare the note on Lat. *crēdo*, Skr. *grād + dādhami* in A. J. P. ib., p. 207). This is proved by the so-called 'gerund' *namas-kṛtya* (AV.), *namas-kṛtya* (MBh. Nala, iv 1 and 14), the general rule being that the 'gerund' from the *simple* root is formed with *-tvā* (whence *kṛtvā*), while the *compounded* root adds *-ya* or (if the root ends in a short vowel, as here) *-tya* (*-kṛtya*). Consequently *-kṛtya* is only found in compounds (v. Whitney, Skr. Roots, Verb-forms, etc., s. v. √ 1 *kṛ-*, p. 21), e. g. *aram-kṛtya* (RV.), *akḥkhalī-kṛtya*² (RV.). Thus *namas-kṛ-* has become a genuine compound just as much as if it had been a compound of *kṛ-* with a prepositional prefix, e. g. *vi-* (cf. Whitney, Skr. Gr., §§990, 990 b, 992).

GREEK:

θυοσ-κέω 'burn a sacrifice, make a burnt offering,' Hesych. Cf. the compounds cited above: θυοσ-κόος θυη-κόος (-κόος from κοέω) θυη-δόχος θυη-πόλος θυη-φάγος. Mr. A. Sidgwick on Aesch. Agam. 87 [where, in place of the MSS θυοσκινέις (the first ι of which is in an erasure, according to Dr. A. W. Verrall on Aesch. Agam., l. c., critical note), he accepts θυοσκεῖς (from θυοσκέω), the emendation of Turnebus, a reading which has, I think, more to recommend it than

¹ In discussing Skr. *mṛḍ-d-ti* *mṛḍīkd-*, Avest. *merʰdika-*, A. J. P. ib., pp. 207, 208, I did not express my meaning with sufficient clearness; I should more correctly have written: Skr. *mṛḍ-d-ti* 'is gracious, pardons,' *mṛḍīkd-*, n. 'grace, pardon,' Avest. *merʰdika-*, n. 'grace, pardon' are to be referred back to an old syntactical combination, either (1) **mṛḡ* (from √ *mṛḡ* 'to wipe off': Skr. *mṛj-d-ti* 'wipes off, cleanses from guilt,' Avest. *marʰz-aiti* 'wipes, cleanses') + *dō-* 'grant a purity from sins,' or (2) **mṛs* (: Skr. *mṛs-ya-tē* 'forgets,' *marʰdyatē* 'bears patiently, excuses, pardons,' Lith. *miṛsz-ti* 'to forget') + *dō-* (by assimilation **mṛsz dō-*) 'grant a forgetting, excuse' (v. Brugmann, Gr. I, §404, 1, and in Idg. Forsch., vol. I, pp. 171, 172; and note that the English translation of the former passage by Joseph Wright is incorrect and misleading).

² By a printer's error this word is written *akḥkhalīkṛtya* in Whitney, Skr. Gr., §990 b.

θύος κινεῖς (the reading of Prien, accepted by Dr. Verrall)] considers -κέω (: θυοσ-κέω) to be very closely connected with καίω 'I burn.'

In conclusion it will be well to touch on Prof. Fay's theory of 'The Latin Gerundive -*ndo*-' which was published in A. J. P. ib., pp. 217 sqq. Prof. Fay there assumes **dhāi* as the original form from which we are to derive Lat. -*dae*, e. g. in Lat. *ferendae* from Idg. **bherndhāi* (: Skr. **bharadhāi*). But such a view takes no account whatever of the Umbr.-Osc. forms, which cannot possibly represent Idg. *dh* (cf. my remarks in A. J. P. ib., pp. 198, 202 and 202, note 3); unless, therefore, we are to regard the Umbr.-Osc. gerundive as borrowed from Latin (a view which does not seem very probable), Prof. Fay's theory must inevitably fall to the ground.¹

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, ENG.
March, 1895.

LIONEL HORTON-SMITH.

¹ Since the above was written, Prof. Fay, in the A. J. P., vol. XVI, part I (April, 1895), has referred to my view on the representation of Idg. *dh* in Italic (A. J. P., vol. XV, pp. 196, 202 and 202, note 3) as being against his theory of the origin of the Latin gerundive, and, in order to maintain his own view, has endeavoured to prove that Idg. -*ndh*->Osc.-Umbr. -*np*->-*nd*->-*nn*-||-*n*-. But the examples adduced do not seem at all convincing. The -*de* of Lat. *inde*, *unde* and (I may add) O.Lat. *quande* *quande* are almost certainly to be referred to Idg. **de*, together with Gk. -*δε* in *δ-δε* *ἐνθέρ-δε* and *ἐνθά-δε* (cf. Per Persson in Idg. Forsch., vol. II, pp. 219, 223, 238, 241; Lindsay, The Lat. Lang., ch. IX, §10, p. 570). Supposing that this (to my mind the most probable) view is correct, it follows that Umbr. *enom* || *ennom* 'then,' if kindred with Lat. *inde*, Umbr. *pone* || *ponne* 'cum,' if identical with Lat. *unde*, Umbr. *pāne*, if identical with O.Lat. *quande*, contain not Idg. *dh*, but Idg. *d* (cf. Per Persson, ib., pp. 219, 240, 241. Brugmann also, in his Grundr., vol. I, §207, IV, §1103, 3, Rem., seems to regard O.Lat. *quande* Umbr. *pāne* as containing Idg. *d*). The *d* of Lat. *endo* || *indu* seems beyond all doubt to represent Idg. *d*, not Idg. *dh*; cf. Gk. *ἐνδο-θι* *ἐνδο-θεν* *ἐνδον* (Brugmann, Gr. Gr.², §201, p. 221; id., Grundr., vol. IV, §1103, 3, Rem.; Lindsay, ib., ch. IX, §27, p. 582). The same is the case with Lat. *quandō* (cf. Per Persson, ib., pp. 219, 219 note 3 ad fin., 238; Lindsay, ib., ch. X, §12, p. 608). I therefore feel compelled to regard Prof. Fay's suggestion, that Idg. -*ndh*- gave Osc.-Umbr. -*np*->-*nd*->-*nn*-||-*n*-, as unproven. Nor, I think, does his concluding observation, that "there was an Aryan doublet to *ndh*, viz. *nd*, represented in Greek *πυθμήν* || *πύνδαξ*," give him much help; for it is thereby implied that the gerundive, which was purely an Italic development (v. A. J. P., vol. XV, p. 195), may have had two quite separate starting-points—one in Latin, the other in Umbr.-Osc.; this view seems very unlikely, especially when the identity of the gerundival construction shewn by Early Latin and Oscan (v. A. J. P., vol. XV, pp. 202, 203) is brought into consideration.